THE MASS ART PAPER

ISSUE NUMBER 2. OCTOBER 30, 1969

THE MORATORIUM

Editorial I

It is not true that the total number of people at Mass. Art supported the Moratorium unanimously. The Editors hoped, in presenting this issue of the Paper dealing solely with the Moratorium, to examine the decisions and indecisions that are too easily over-simplified and over-looked by using the term "college policy". In order to do this, we had to separate the whole into its component parts; we had to ask individuals to react in words to the Moratorium. From a Student Body of 650 people, we received 10 reactions. From a Faculty and Administration Body of 47, we received 8 reactions. What are we to conclude from this? It would be gruesome and incorrect to think that only 18 out of 697 people reacted to something as compelling on so many different levels as the Moratorium was. Can it be true that the people of Mass. Art still have no confidence in the potential importance of a "newspaper" within the college?

B.D.

Editorial II

In reviewing the events of October 15th, we are considering the impact on three different levels: national, institutional (on Mass. Art as a social institution), and, if possible, personal.

I.

This peculiar editor actually found herself glad, on October 15th, that such masters-of-blunder as Nixon and Agnew were elected last November. Never has the misapplication of government been so clear, and so gallantly, ineptly defended, as in this administration. Had Hubert been elected, the misapplication would have existed, but would have been subtle, detected only by a few perceptive critics who could have been easily written off as raving radicals. The unabashed depravity of the Nixon Administration, however, is so blatant that even doctors and lawyers, usually the nice sensible citizens, are feeling cheated enough to emerge from the security of Harvard Medical School and various upstanding law organizations to declare their indignation.

The Nixon breach of public trust, coupled with an almost total absence of violence on the part of those participating in the Moratorium, is serving to convince the generally unaffected public that to believe something could be wrong in the government, something of which our involvement is only a by-product, does not necessarily qualify the believer for chastisement as a "Commie Prevert" (re: "Dr. Strangelove, or How I Learned to Love the Bomb").

Despite the fact that those taking part on October 15th were encouraged by what our fearless leader Mr. Agnew calls "impudent snobs", the Moratorium can be viewed as a success. Support far exceeded the expectations of its originators, to the point where the meaning of the day cannot be ignored, even by its opponents.

II.

Dean McGavern, in the midst of an informal conversation recently, revealed a frightening observation he made when he first visited this college last year. He has had extensive experience in working with the mentally ill, and one thing he said that characterizes them is their hopelessness, their absolute complacency towards even the most chilling violations against them. In this respect, he equated the Mass. Art outlook with that of the mentally ill.

Things are changing fast here. Half the student body took part in the Moratorium. This was phenomenal; there has not been such a collective assertion of political opinion at Mass. Art for a long, long time. The overall pervasive feeling has always been that to speak out on anything outside the realm of art would leave the speaker vulnerable, that a social concern, no matter how threatening, was not worth exposing his cherished and frail private self for. Until now.

III.

It is essential that each individual carefully think out his attitude towards the issues of the Moratorium, and respond most honestly according to his nature. This does not not preclude disagreement with the Moratorium. Too many people in the college still feel intimidated about voicing their honest opinions, they are too used to the sanctions of previous college administrations. One teacher did not want to issue his statement against the Moratorium because he didn't want his opinion to be subjected in print to the eyes of the Board of Trustees. We wonder if this teacher realized how much

(Continued on Page 3)

Student-Teacher-Administration Reactions

Dean McGovern & Dr. Hawthorne

I

Cut it fine, put in shades of grey, elaborate the obvious to the point of obscurity, or even wrap our honorable flag around it; no matter how you say it, WE ARE AT WAR.

The war will be called, by those more objective than ourselves, the "irrelevant war" or the "war of overweening pride". Our sole objective now is to extricate ourselves from a small devastated land and to do so with "honor."

When almost 400 people from our College marched to Boston Common on October 15th we were influencing national policy. Since the Presidential Office has become impervious to congressional persuasion it has to fall on us to give all of our leaders a push. If you feel like you're in a minority, don't worry. Most important things in America have been done by minorities; good or bad.

David McGovern
Dean of Students

II

The Moratorium was too easy. For an intellectual community like Boston, for a faculty somewhat protected by academic freedom, for a student body free from job or family pressure, cancelling class is a painless way to demonstrate dissatisfaction. Even coming to the planned assembly and marching to a pre-arranged rally are easy balms for uneasy consciences.

Granted, the uneasy consciences should be on the other side. It does seem grossly undemocratic for our elected officials to get us into a war that most people really don't want. And it does seem undemocratic (though of course eminently political) for them to expect us to reflect our feelings only on election day. (Just TRY to vote for peace by choosing between Nixon and Humphrey). And it does seem undemocratic for us to have to ache and bleed in the streets to show what we tried unsuccessfully to show on election day. But practically we must; we must do something hard. Specifically, on October 15 the faculty should at least have given up their day's salary. On November 14 the students should put in a full day at school and then start sacrificing time, money, and talents to end this war.

by E. Moore

III

With only one or two instances of frivolity, we observed at the Moratorium an admirable atmosphere of appropriately serious purpose. The event generates our reflection upon not only the question of Vietnam but upon the whole range of student attitudes. We would hope that students were truly repudiating not only war, but violence in personal relations as well. It is common knowledge that animals of the same species avoid lethal hostilities for the compelling reason that the species's survival will be endangered if they don't. If war is an international projection of the inner conflicts of individuals, the solution is to free, through psychotherapy, at least the decision-making leaders. We do not really believe that President Nixon is psychologically "resisting" a solution to Viet Nam, however. There is fear that such may be the case, though. Awareness is basic to all forms of psychotherapy, and since formal treatment procedures are not likely to be initiated in the circle of our national leadership, we urge the provision of such vital awareness to our leaders by way of peaceful activism. Nations, like people, can suffer from distorted perceptions of reality. A nation may have an unrealistic image of another state or it may rigidly and excessively identify with its own ideology. In any case, awareness is the cure, and it is fitting that this awareness be provided our leaders by students who have such a mortal stake in the future. We are not suggesting that conflict be eliminated from life; that is neither possible nor desirable. We do advocate the peaceful resolution of conflict and the emergence of a climate of nonviolence. Our obvious impatience the other day with a busy public telephone in this building was noticed by the occupant who responded with a "V" signal of peace. We welcome such rebukes.

A word of commendation for our own students and faculty is surely in order. Our (correct?) understanding of the artistic nature's preference for communication by way of solitary creative work rather than through more direct relationships and involvements causes us to regard their participation in the events of October 15 as a true assumption of social responsibility.

CHARLES CHURCHILL

IV

I don't know what the Moratorium was like. A fair number of students sat in the auditorium and applauded everything; the signs were fairly colorful and fairly clever; the day was so perfectly sunny and perfectly airy that every step of the walk to the Common was an affirmation of health and life, celebrated by outbursts of song.

What have signs and songs and sun to do with politics and pressure? We were comfortable and at ease with each other as we walked and as we sat on the grass on the Common. We heard people say the unsayable – that a war with badly defined or confused purposes could damage us and our honor much more than unilateral withdrawal would; that we have lost whatever it was we set out to win and the enemy might as well know it. We were at ease when it was said, with our consciences and with our sense of truth. Ease and vast relief – perhaps it was all deceptive, but the sun was real and the people squinting in the sun for those moments felt real.

by Marjorie Hellerstein

V

You have asked me to comment on the October 15th Moratorium. And you asked me also whether Mass. Art was becoming politically oriented. I don't know what has happened. I don't think any of us think we know or could agree to what it is that has happened. The fact is, however, that the place is different.

The arrival of a new President is, of course, important. Any new President might be a monster. In Jack Nolan's case, it seems clear that he is not only not a monster, but not even an ordinary College President. He is much more than we could have hoped for, even last year. His presence certainly helps to explain the change that we have seen take place this fall.

Wed. last, 350 Mass. Art Students marched in protest against the War, and more than against the War. To a large extent, we marched together because we wanted to be together. The new situation, including the new president, is certainly a catalyst. But the ingredients had to have been there in order to make this catalyst work.

We are changed. It may be you, the new generation, it may be our new administration. I do not know, but we have changed. Never before have Mass. Art students been able to feel that they could participate in public protests, be ins, paint ins, even Rock music in the cafeteria, etc.

I wouldn't yet call this the most politically aware college in Boston. But awareness has to begin somewhere, and I'm very glad to see it begin the way it has.

by Dr. Bruce Hawthorne

VI

How could anyone fail to listen to that which was made visible October 15th, 1969?

Robert P. Moore Jr.

VII

It was gratifying to observe both the degree of participation and enthusiasm shown by our students on National Moratorium Day. The concern shown that day toward this relevant issue reflects an increased awareness of life outside the college that was not apparent two or three years ago. As artists we are apt to get bogged down in philosophic acrobatics when the present demands of society cannot allow this kind of lunacy any longer. Today's problems must be faced on moralistic or ethical grounds and the occupants of the ivory towers are just not in the mainstream. "Doing your own thing" was great when time was on our side but today the egocentric maker of images is danger of waking up some morning to find no world remains on which he can escape from reality. Moratorium Day indicates that most of our students are willing to confront life. If this attitude can be maintained then this institution can become a viable force in resolving the complex problems faced by man. While I was extremely gratified with the large turn out on Boston Common, I was more pleased with Mass. Art's involvement.

Donald Lettis

VIII

I kept my son out of school so that he could see some direct semblance of the right of the self governed to vote for a change in their lives.

Harris Barron

CREDIT BOX

Editor-Barbara Duval

General Critic/Editor-
Elaine Luti

Photography-Charles Lew

Thanks to all contributors

1

Woodstock and the Moratorium have shown us one thing: what we need in this country is a two party system – one on Friday and one on Saturday

Eric Kimball

2

What's a Moratorium?
T. Jefferson
J. Hancock
G. Washington
– Anonymous

ed.'s note: Comments like these are always a source of comfort to those engaged in the struggle of maintaining the status quo.

3

In the eyes of the VFW or the American Legion, October 15th was treason of the highest order, a plot against the fiber of America, masterminded by the International Communist Conspiracy. There are, however, many "veterans" who have returned from the Far East that are being re-educated to the facts of American life via the way it is and not via Uncle Sam.

The War made us political pawns of an ideology hell bent on destroying our Vietnamese brothers and their way of life. Many of us are ashamed of this country and ourselves for not having been aware of the truth before we participated in the attempted murder of a race - any help given to the military at this time is an endorsement of genocide.

Moratorium Day can help to show the GI's and returning veterans a little light as they struggle to learn truth and maybe they will be strong enough never to shed their blood for lies again, maybe they will be able to turn the unjustifiable deaths of their friends and brother Vietnamese into a cry of disgust so loud no politician can turn a deaf ear.

Michael O'Sullivan

Michael O'Sullivan is a former Marine.)

4

The most intriguing aspect of the October 15th Moratorium was the evidence of a broadening peace movement to include groups not normally involved in dissent. It is perhaps indicative of the movement's changing nature that the Moratorium was conceived by a businessman. This would suggest two interpretations. One, that Americans are coming to understand the nature of our involvement in Viet Nam; or, second, they are simply fed up with the continuation of a painful ambiguous conflict.

For most people outside the academic community the second interpretation is more applicable and it is this development we must understand. Editorial after editorial in the weeks before the Moratorium warned us of the fact that there would be two participating groups. The first group would be the concerned, respectable majority of outraged citizens who would make their dignified protest. The second group would be composed of those who would "subvert" the majority and manipulate it to its own end. We were told that the first group was somehow more legitimate than the second. We were told that the second expressed a nihilism to which no American could subscribe.

Editorial rhetoric has the profound ability to deal with reality in symbolic terms and to manipulate the symbolism so that it parallels reality, without touching upon the reality of things. The media were right that there were two groups, but they dealt with the nature of each in terms that would keep the first from understanding the second. In short, they supported the right to dissent without constraining any possibility that the Moratorium would become an event radicalizing all participants.

Howard Zinn was correct when, in his speech on the Common, he really wished that Viet Nam were the only thing wrong with a basically just and democratic society. He regretted that it was not so and attempted to define how it was related to the economic, social, and political structure of the country.

It is this kind of understanding which most politicians fear, for the real tragedy of this war is that it was initially escalated as a Liberal's war. We were told that the "Communists" could be checked abroad and that we could have a great society at home. The war has now fallen by default into the hands of Richard Nixon, but the gnawing reality is that it was conceived and prosecuted by supposedly reasonable, humane officials who suddenly, and inexplicably became unreasonable and unhumane under the imperitives of U.S. foreign policy. The real value of a Moratorium lies in understanding those imperatives and in their relationship to the quality and direction of American Life.

by Michael Hachey

5

I remember the day my grandfather died. It was a Saturday. And as on every Saturday in late September, there was a high school football game. Feeling that I could accomplish nothing staying at home, I went to the game. Nobody there even cared that a man had ceased to be. Their world went on per usual. It really struck me how insignificant one man's life is.

I can't help but feel the same after the Moratorium. How many men have died? But the War still goes on and so does the football game. Oh! and the Mets won.

Frank Siccome

6

The march brought pressure. The march of students and teachers and other citizens of Greater Boston, the young thinkers, was almost frightening (Hitler Youth?). What do we want? Peace! When are we going to get it? Now! Peace now! Peace now! Spontaneous outbursts, walking, running, marching, singing – a march for the Dead.

The speeches at the Common were anti-climactic.

by Marie Rock

7

In my opinion, the U.S. should not have gone in the war in the first place, just sent supplies like the Communist countries. Now that the U.S. is in, it cannot drop everyth
it wasn't its business. The U.S. made it its business and has to leave it honorably.

Rosario Cascio

8

Did you know we still have fighting men in Viet Nam, and that nothing has been done to bring them home? Do you still reflect on Moratorium Day or is that now a dead issue?

The little guy in Viet Nam hasn't forgotten. He's been paying tribute to foreign powers for centuries. First China, then France, then the Japanese occupation forces, again France (with help from the U.S.) and then and now from the U.S. itself.

Now we don't need tribute, and one of the golden ideals we have rationalized for this war is to help the Vietnamese become self governed. Have we forgotten that we gave arms and munitions to Ho Chi Minh during World War II to help him successfully defeat the Japanese invasion force which crippled the French forces there? And are we ignorant that the Viet Minh, under the leadership of Uncle Ho, established a popular supported government in Saigon after the victory? And do you realize that the American forces removed this government immediately and returned the Vietnamese to French control?

And who has any legal or moral right to divide or condone division of a nation and promise "free" elections which had, as a conclusion, the runner-up candidate imprisoned?

And can't you see that the domino theory is a lame excuse to bolster our economy through war?

And after five years, can you stomach three, two, or even one more?

Moratorium Day of October 15th is over, but the illegal action of war is not. November 14-15 is coming-or have you forgotten?

David Hawkins

(David Hawkins is a Veteran)

EDITORIAL
(Continued from Page 1)

he was jeopardizing student respect for him by his lack of courage.)

To those who have chosen to support the Moratorium, we ask you to consider the following thought: if criticism is to be meaningful, it must be supported by facts and enforced by action. The facts supporting your choice are all too available. We urge you to carry out the mandate established by the October 15th Moratorium by acting in November, December, January, February, and on until you feel an equitable answer has been given to the questions you are asking.

9

Dear Diary, October 15th, today Jeanne and I played fish in the back yard. She said I cheated but it was *my* deck of cards.

What did I do on October 15th? On October 15th I registered to vote, and thereby de-activated one hawk. I do not usually condone hunting but I would consider collecting hawks a fine hobby. Just fine.

p.s. How about printing a definition of "moratorium".

Kathy Ingoldsby

for Kathy:

moratorium: A period of permissive or obligatory delay; spec. Lay, a period during which an obliger has a legal right to delay meeting an obligation, esp. such a period granted in an emergency, as to a bank or debtors, generally by noratory law

Webster's Collegiate Dictionary

Fifth Edition

10

The Student Government has allotted two hundred dollars to subsidize expenses for transportation to Washington D.C. for the rally November 15th. As soon as the details are worked out as to the cheapest means of defraying the cost of transportation, the general school body will be notified. This is mainly a way of providing those who want to go but feel that transportation costs are too great with transportation that is within their budget.

REVIEWS

The Bean Signal Corps-A Review

The several skits that were presented by the Bean Signal Corps as part of the Moratorium Day morning program were, to say the least, interesting.

Some of the participants displayed an eagerness that could be felt in their performance. Others, however, ruined the skits by carelessly executing their roles. Almost all of the vignettes, unfortunately, revealed a lack of preparation, probably because they were rehearsed only once or not at all. This lack of preparation caused tense voids of silence between lines which irritated the audience. The players abandoned several poorly-developed skits without reaching any conclusion. The audience was then confused; we had to decide whether to applaud or not. Credit must be given, though, to some of the players for their fine ad-libbing ability. The spontaneity of the remarks was one of the most enjoyable things about the skits.

The Bean Signal Corps' success is somewhat doubtful, but the efforts must be appreciated.

Richard Szczypek

A History Of The Wars And The Four People In America-A Review

When a dance is performed for an audience and is presented as part of a program of protest against the war in Vietnam it second or third it becomes subtle, but after the fifteenth high pitched scream it just becomes annoying. There is a fine line between the obscure and the subtle, but there is more of a brick wall between the subtle and the blatantly obvious.

My final criticism of the production is that it was difficult to see any relation between it and the Moratorium, other than the fact that it was in some sense a portrait of America, and the Vietnam war is an American war. But this is a little too distant to be much of a correlation.

Although the production could have been regarded as a purely formal dance, first, I don't think it was very good at that, and second, it offered a rationale that didn't even mention formal considerations.

There is a difference between intuition and arbitrariness; a dancer can compose a dance of movements understood only to himself, but once he does it for an audience it can very easily become a pretentious display of ego immediately defines itself to a certain extent and offers some criteria by which to judge it. When it prints a rationale (see last issue of the paper) it becomes even more specific. To say, then, that it is merely a personal expression, or that it is not subject to interpretation, or that the performers have no obligation to make themselves understood is self contradictory. This doesn't mean that everything must be completely obvious to everyone in the audience, or that the performers have to lower their standards, but if a fairly intelligent audience of people supposedly sensitive to art and visual imagery find an artistic production obscure, then the fault may not be in the audience but in the production.

According to the rationale there were supposed to be four characters, three physically present and a fourth who represented the collective spirit of the other three and who was not physically there. I can't see how this concept could have been understood from the dance alone; there seemed to be no attempt to get this across. Further, even assuming they succeeded in communicating the idea, I can't see how it really has any relation to the theme of the dance—except in the most distant way, that the dance was about America, and America is a gestalt of its people.

Further it says, "They dance alone together, they speak in silence". This is perhaps the main idea of the dance, and it is easy to see where it is communicated in the production. The whole dance, in fact put across the idea that nobody is listening to anybody, that each of the characters is acting independently, and absurdly, (although this again appears to be in direct contradiction of the central force idea mentioned earlier.) A girl screaming for someones attention ad nauseam can be interpreted as the disinteredness of the universe in man, or men's alienation from each other. There is a point, however, when things can get out of hand. The first "attention please" is obscure, by the and there is then no point in burdening an audience with it. Nevertheless it's nice to see someone working in dance ... maybe we can expect more from future productions.

E.L

Newsreel-A Review

One of the programs on Moratorium Day at Mass Art was a "newsreel" on ROTC.

First, it may be conceit, but I don't like films that consider it unnecessary to defend themselves rationally but appeal to emotion and intentionally leave openings for convenient false generalizations to get their point across. I don't like the implication that if given mere facts I couldn't come to a good conclusion on my own. Moreover, I don't like symbols tossed at me which I'm expected to hiss at or salivate to; and when it's feared that I won't be able to detect the proper enemy, I greatly resent having him labeled for me – (to wit, "The Liberal Viewpoint" for anyone not yet experienced at coming to conclusions without thinking, who can't recognize a liberal by what he says.)

An argument comes close to disproving itself if it has to invent facts, or dig up irrelevant ones to prove its point. What relevance are statements by officials when those statements are over fifty years old? The government representatives today may say similar things, but if they do, those are the statements that count.

The "Newsreel" appealed to the same types of minds and called for the same type of reaction as those that the people now in power used to get themselves and keep themselves where they are.

Formula; Find a man to represent the opposing viewpoint. Make sure he will be likely to come up with some stupid statements. Tape him. Show it to an audience that already would tend to agree with the desired conclusion anyway and they will easily make the syllogism: 1. This man represents ROTC, 2. This man is a jerk, 3. ROTC is run by jerks – with the corollary that it should be abolished forthwith.

Parallel: Find a man to represent a minority viewpoint, see to it that he makes some derrogatory cracks about apple pie, or anything dear to the hearts of the audience, and they will easily make the argument: 1. This man has this viewpoint, 2. This man also sounds like a commie pervert, 3. Therefore all men with this viewpoint are commie perverts. This method is the same and it doesn't produce a good support for any viewpoint. All it amounts to is patting oneself on the back while offering nothing new for consideration. All the film proved was that there are a couple of ROTC heads who are inclined to make stupid remarks.

Another reason I don't like the film is that the conclusion it supports is not so obvious as it seems. One problem is that I think attacks on ROTC are misdirected. Getting ROTC off the colleges won't stop the war, or stop the draft. But abolishing the draft will probably all but eliminate ROTC, since the incentive to join is that it is better to be drafted as an officer. Further, as long as there is a draft it is better to have ROTC than more West Points – at least a person from an independent college will be less indoctrinated, more likely to question things than one with four years of intensive brain - washing behind him.

I don't think abolishing ROTC will accomplish anything on its own. The Army will get its officers if it wants them, and I doubt if the Army would resort to something so democratic as promoting them from lower ranks. In fact, they will probably get them by opening new West Points, or special crash courses after college.

Also, if ROTC was abolished altogether, the people who would have joined it would still be the same people, and would have to find some other release for their agression. I'd rather see them plunging bayonets into cloth sacks.

The whole issue of ROTC on campus is a great deal more complex than "good people will say this and bad people will say that."

Films that appeal to the emotional opinions and prejudices of their audience actually do nothing to improve a case for either side, and as a byproduct they make people a little less responsible in their opinions and a little more prone to be swayed by the type of mindless propaganda that is given by people of all sides who want easy answers.

E. L.